

Radiation Pressure Supported Stars in Einstein Gravity: Eternally Collapsing Objects

A. Mitra^{1*}

¹ *Max Planck Institut fur Kernphysik, Saupfercheckweg 1, D-69117 Heidelberg, Germany*

Accepted 2006 March 16. Received 2006 March 15; in original form 2006 January 13

ABSTRACT

Even when we consider Newtonian stars, i.e., stars with surface gravitational redshift, $z \ll 1$, it is well known that, theoretically, it is possible to have stars, supported against self-gravity, almost entirely by radiation pressure. However, such Newtonian stars must necessarily be supermassive (Hoyle and Fowler 1963; Fowler 1966; Weinberg 1972). We point out that this requirement for excessive large M in Newtonian case, is a consequence of the occurrence of low $z \ll 1$. But if we remove such restrictions, and allow for possible occurrence of highly general relativistic regime, $z \gg 1$, we show that, it is possible to have radiation pressure supported stars at arbitrary value of M . Since radiation pressure supported stars necessarily radiate at the Eddington limit, in Einstein gravity, they are never in strict hydrodynamical equilibrium. Further, it is believed that sufficiently massive or dense objects undergo continued gravitational collapse to the Black Hole stage characterized by $z = \infty$. Thus, late stages of Black Hole formation, by definition, will have, $z \gg 1$, and hence would be examples of quasi-stable general relativistic radiation pressure supported stars (Mitra 2006). It is shown that the observed duration of such Eddington limited radiation pressure dominates states is $t \approx 5 \times 10^8(1+z)$ yr. Thus, $t \rightarrow \infty$ as Black Hole formation ($z \rightarrow \infty$) would take place. Consequently, such radiation pressure dominated extreme general relativistic stars become Eternally Collapsing Objects (ECOs) and the BH state is preceded by such an ECO phase. This result is also supported by our previous finding that trapped surfaces are not formed in gravitational collapse (Mitra1 2005) and the value of the integration constant in the vacuum Schwarzschild solution is zero (Mitra2 2005). Hence the supposed observed BHs are actually ECOs.

Key words: black hole physics - gravitation - stars : fundamental parameters.

1 INTRODUCTION

Stars may be defined as objects with an intrinsic self-luminosity which is generally sustained by the grip of self-gravity. Most of the stars that we know of are primarily supported by gas pressure p_g rather than by radiation pressure p_r . The usually insignificant role of p_r is indicated by the parameter (Chandrasekhar 1967):

$$\beta = \frac{p_g}{p} \quad (1)$$

where $p = p_g + p_r$ is the total pressure. For most of the known luminous (Newtonian) stars $\beta \approx 1$. The actual role of p_r is seen more clearly from the adjoint parameter:

$$1 - \beta = \frac{p_r}{p} \quad (2)$$

The relative role of p_r may even be more directly expressed through the parameter

$$x \equiv \frac{p_r}{p_g} = \frac{1 - \beta}{\beta} \quad (3)$$

For real astrophysical objects, x would be highest at the centre and in general decrease significantly towards the surface. The central value of $x^* = 0.006$ for the Sun and the same for a $4M_\odot$ mainsequence star is 0.012 (as kindly pointed out by the anonymous referee) ($\odot$ denotes solar values). It may be borne in mind that the mean value of $(1 - \beta) \ll (1 - \beta^*)$. It is known, however, that the value of $(1 - \beta^*)$ would rise significantly if the value of M would be very high though we hardly know of any single Newtonian star with $M > 100M_\odot$. In fact it may be pointed out that in any given stellar model, it is the value of $(1 - \beta^*)$ which determines the mass of the star (Chandrasekhar 1967). Suppose one makes stellar models with a fixed composition (μ).

* On leave from BARC, Mumbai-400085 India, Abhas.Mitra@mpi-hd.mpg.de

Then under the assumption of fixed chemical composition, a stellar mass of M will get defined from the equation (Chandrasekhar 1967) (p. 82):

$$\frac{1 - \beta^*}{\beta^{*4}} = \frac{1 - \beta_\odot}{\beta_\odot^4} \left(\frac{M}{M_\odot} \right)^2 \quad (4)$$

so that M slowly increases with decreasing β^* (increasing x). Note $M \rightarrow 0$ if $\beta^* \rightarrow 1$ or $x^* \rightarrow 0$ in this non-quantum case, and to have a finite mass luminous star, one must have a finite value of x . Even in the case of (partially) degenerate objects, a low value of β , or a higher value of x would raise their masses. The usual Chandrasekhar mass, M_c corresponds to a perfectly degenerate object having ultimate relativistic degeneracy where momentum of the pressure giving particles $P \rightarrow \infty$ and further the object is absolutely cold, $T = 0$. Moreover, it may be reminded that, *the radius of Chandrasekhar's critical white dwarf is zero, $R_c = 0$!* This shows that, only an infinitely dense singular configuration could be perfectly degenerate and have $T = 0$, and, on the other hand, all real finite configurations, in the strict sense, must be either partially degenerate or at a finite T . When the compact object has a finite temperature despite having assumed degeneracy, the mass *upper limit gets modified* as (Chandrasekhar 1967) (see p. 437):

$$\mathcal{M}_c = M_c \beta^{-3/2} \quad (5)$$

In order to keep the object almost “completely degenerate”, Chandrasekhar imposed some artificial restrictions on the value of β which resulted in

$$\mathcal{M}_c = 1.156 M_c \quad (6)$$

But the fact remains that perfect degeneracy, in a strict sense, corresponds to $\beta = 1.0$ or $x = 0$. It may be noted that the *radius of this almost completely degenerate white dwarf too is zero, $R_c = 0$* (Chandrasekhar 1967) (see p. 441, eq. 140). However, theoretically, the possibility of having arbitrary finite x cannot be ruled out. As value of x would rise, the system would be more and more partially degenerate and soon, it would be more meaningful to call it “non-degenerate”. In such a case, as $\beta \rightarrow 0$, one may have $\mathcal{M}_c \rightarrow \infty$, i.e., *the very notion of an “upper mass limit” would vanish*. Actually, the applicability of Eq.(5) would cease once degree of degeneracy would significantly reduce.

As indicated by Eq.(4), in principle, an initially nondegenerate sequence of stars can always be turned into radiation pressure supported stars (RPSSs) by considering appropriate higher value of M and vice-versa. Thus, irrespective of whether one follows the standard non-degenerate route or the degenerate route, one may, in principle, end up with non-degenerate radiation pressure supported stars. Now we focus attention on the question of mass range of such radiation pressure supported stars (RPSS) in the context of both Newtonian and Einstein gravity.

2 GENERAL FORMALISM

In reality, even if one would consider the stellar material to be pure hydrogen, at sufficiently high temperature, one would have pressure contribution from both electrons and protons. Also there will always be rest mass contribution

by the electrons. But in the following, since we are interested only in seeing some new qualitative result, we will consider an idealized fluid which is assumed to always remain monoatomic. The total proper mass energy density of this fluid is

$$\rho = \rho_g + (\gamma - 1)^{-1} p_g + \rho_r \quad (7)$$

where

$$\rho_g = m_p n c^2 \quad (8)$$

is the (baryonic) rest mass energy density, n is the proper baryonic number density, m_p is proton rest mass, c is the speed of light, and γ is the ratio of specific heats. Also

$$p_g = nkT \quad (9)$$

is the gas pressure, where k is Boltzmann constant and

$$\rho_r = aT^4 \quad (10)$$

is the radiation energy density. Here $a = 7.56 \times 10^{-15}$ erg cm⁻³ K⁻⁴ is the radiation constant. As is known,

$$p_r = \frac{1}{3} aT^4 \quad (11)$$

From Eqs. (9) and (11), we may also find that

$$x = \frac{p_r}{p_g} = \frac{aT^3}{3nk} \quad (12)$$

Further, instead of β , it will be more convenient define a quantity $\beta_w = x^{-1} = p_g/p_r$. One may also define a related parameter

$$y = \frac{\rho_r}{\rho_g} = \frac{aT^4}{m_p n c^2} \quad (13)$$

which is the ratio of the radiation energy density and the rest mass energy density. In Newtonian gravity, one has $\rho_r \ll \rho_g$, i.e., $y \ll 1$, and, consequently, $\rho \approx \rho_g$. In idealized models, fluids may be characterized by a polytropic equation of state (EOS):

$$p = K \rho^{1+1/m} \quad (14)$$

where K must be uniform within the fluid. If there would exist a *strictly static* self-gravitating configuration, where, K and m would be same everywhere, then one would have a polytrope of degree “ m ”. For the construction of stellar models, one looks for polytropes which have a finite boundary radius R . Mathematically, this would mean that, $\rho = p = 0$ for $r > R$. Both in Newtonian and GR case, in a strict sense, *this vital boundary condition can be satisfied only if the object is absolutely cold $T = 0$* so that $p_r = \rho_r = 0$ for $r > R$ and because one may indeed make $p_g = \rho_g = 0$ at the boundary. In Newtonian gravity, since, $\rho_r = 0$, and $\rho = \rho_g$, this boundary condition can be satisfied much more accurately if not absolutely. In Newtonian gravity, one can consider the results obtained by static polytropic models to be reasonably accurate. Now we shall attempt to qualitatively understand why Newtonian RPSSs must be of extremely high mass.

2.1 RPSSs in Newtonian Gravity

For the best known low mass Newtonian star, namely the Sun, as we know, the *central value* of $\beta_* \approx \beta_w \approx 0.003$. Since T drops sharply as one moves away from the centre,

the mean value of β must be extremely low in comparison to the above value. One may estimate the mean value of x for low mass Newtonian stars in the following way. By using Newtonian virial theorem for Newtonian stars, one can estimate the internal energy of the star as (Chandrasekhar 1967)

$$U = \frac{1}{(5\gamma - 6)} \frac{GM^2}{R} \quad (15)$$

where γ is the effective ratio of specific heats, G is the gravitational constant and R is the radius of the star. As long as radiation pressure is really small, one can have $\gamma \approx 5/3$. Further, if the mean temperature of the assumed monoatomic gas is T_m , one has

$$U = \frac{3}{2} \frac{M}{m_p} kT_m \quad (16)$$

Then by combining Eqs. (15) and (16), it follows that

$$kT_m = \frac{2}{7} \frac{GMm_p}{R} \quad (17)$$

In terms of the surface redshift or compactness $z = GM/Rc^2$, we can rewrite the mean temperature as

$$kT_m = \frac{2}{7} z m_p c^2 \quad (18)$$

We may recall that for Sun, $z \approx 2 \times 10^{-6}$. This shows that the temperature of Newtonian stars are necessarily low *because they are hardly compact*, i.e., $z \ll 1$. Alternatively, since, kT_m is low in comparison to nucleon rest mass energy $m_p c^2$, radiation pressure is low. In other words, radiation pressure is relatively low (for low M stars) because compactness is so low. One can ask then, what is the appropriate mean value of x for low mass Newtonian stars. To see this we invoke a relationship which shows that for $z \ll 1$, one has (Mitra 2006)

$$y \sim \alpha \frac{GM}{Rc^2} \sim \alpha z \quad (19)$$

where

$$\alpha = \frac{L}{L_{ed}} \quad (20)$$

is the luminosity of the star in terms of its Eddington luminosity L_{ed} . By combining Eqs. (12), (13) and (19), we find that

$$x \approx \alpha z \frac{m_p c^2}{3kT} \quad (21)$$

Since we are interested only in the gross mean properties rather than precise central quantities, in the foregoing equation, we may consider $T = T_m$ because virial temperature is a reasonably good measure of the gross mean temperature. Then we may use Eq.(18) in Eq.(21) to find that

$$x \approx \frac{7\alpha}{6} \approx \alpha \quad (22)$$

For Sun, L_{ed} , at the surface is 1.3×10^{38} erg/s so that $\alpha \sim 3 \times 10^{-5}$. Therefore the mean value of x for Sun is also $\sim 3 \times 10^{-5}$. Again recall that, $z \approx 2 \times 10^{-6}$ for the Sun. Note the cosmic coincidence that, for Sun, the three apparently uncorrelated dimensionless quantities, namely, x , α and z have similar values within a factor of 10! In order to become a RPSS, the value of mean x has to rise from

such an extreme low value to attain a stage of $x \gg 1$. Since for low mass stars, $L \sim M^{5.5}/R^{0.5}$ while $L_{ed} \sim M$, we will have, $\alpha = L/L_{ed} \sim M^{4.5}/R^{0.5}$. For low mass main-sequence stars, crudely, $M \propto R$, so that, $\alpha \sim M^4$. Thus if one would move to higher mass stars, initially, mean x would increase very rapidly. However, as x increases, Eq.(15) would need significant revision as the star would move away from being a gas pressure dominated $\gamma \approx 5/3$ polytrope to a radiation pressure dominated $\gamma \approx 4/3$ polytrope. In such a case, the pattern of variation of x with M would change drastically. It appears, that, in the regime of $p_r \gg p_g$, the supposed Newtonian static RPSSs may be reasonably described by a Newtonian polytrope with $m \approx 3$ (Weinberg 1972). Then, the mass of the star is (Weinberg 1972)

$$M = 18M_\odot \beta_w^{-2} \mu^2 = 18M_\odot x^2 \mu^2 \quad (23)$$

where μ is the mean molecular weight. For a fully ionized hydrogen plasma $\mu = 2$ It is interesting to invert Eq.(23) as

$$x \approx 0.2 \left(\frac{M}{M_\odot} \right)^{1/2} \mu^{-1} \quad (24)$$

which shows that in the large M range x increases relatively more rapidly as $M^{1/2}$ for the Newtonian stars. And eventually, still, M has to be very high to ensure $x \gg 1$. To have a value of $x \sim 10$ (atleast) one must have, $M \sim 1800M_\odot \mu^2$ which is already very high. Note that, since, in principle, x can be arbitrarily high, again, there is *no upper limit on the mass of self-gravitating configurations once we allow existence of sufficiently high radiation pressure*. We may also see how the ‘‘compactness’’ of the Newtonian star would change in this very high M range. To appreciate this point further, we consider specific model of Newtonian RPSSs (Weinberg 1972) (see Eq. [11.5.9]):

$$R \propto \beta_w^{-2/3} \propto x^{2/3} \quad (25)$$

Using Eqs. (23) and (25), we find then, that, in Newtonian case

$$z \propto M/R \propto x^{4/3} \quad (26)$$

Further, using Eq.(24) into the foregoing equation, we see that

$$z \propto (M^{1/2})^{4/3} \propto M^{2/3} \quad (27)$$

also increases quite rapidly with mass. Thus compared to the low mass Newtonian stars, in the high mass range, *on a relative scale*, one can have quite high values of z . However, this does not mean that for Newtonian stars one can ever have $z \gg 1$. This point has been emphasized by Weinberg:

• The entire derivation leading to the concept of any Newtonian star necessarily assumes $y \equiv \rho_r/\rho_g \ll 1$. And this assumption must be ensured for (Newtonian) super-massive stars as well. As shown by Weinberg, in such a case, one must always have (Weinberg 1972)

$$z = \frac{GM}{Rc^2} \ll 0.39 \quad (28)$$

In summary, the *fundamental reason that Newtonian RPSSs stars are extremely massive is that, by definition, $z \ll 1$* , and, in particular, $z \ll 0.39$. It may be also pointed out that since in general $L \propto M^d$, where, $d > 1$ (for low mass stars, $d \sim 5$), and $L_{ed} \propto M$, α in general increases with M . Then Eq.(27) would show that, atleast, in the Newtonian regime,

in general, α increases with z . However, the maximum value of $\alpha = 1$, and all the RPSSs, Newtonian or Relativistic, have this maximal value of α because a larger α would disrupt the star due to excessive radiation pressure.

3 RADIATION PRESSURE SUPPORTED STARS IN EINSTEIN GRAVITY

The general definition of “compactness” in GR may be given in terms of the surface redshift

$$z = (1 - 2GM/Rc^2)^{-1/2} - 1 \quad (29)$$

One then easily finds that when $GM/Rc^2 \ll 1$, (i.e., in the truly Newtonian regime), one has

$$z \approx GM/Rc^2 \quad (30)$$

It also follows that, the Event Horizon of a Black Hole (BH), defined by $R = R_s = 2GM/c^2$ corresponds to $z = \infty$. And this explains why gravitation is extremely strong for BHs. As is well known, very massive objects undergo continued collapse to become Black Holes. Thus, by definition, very massive objects, during their continued collapse, must pass through stages having $z > \text{any finite number}$. Although, it is not necessary, we may nonetheless mention that the exterior spacetime of any contracting self-gravitating object is represented by *radiating* Vaidya metric (Vaidya 1951) which allows the possibility that $z \rightarrow \infty$. Further, it has been shown that, whenever, self-luminous objects have $z \gg 1$ (Mitra 2006), one will have

$$y \sim \alpha z/2 \quad (31)$$

Then by combining Eqs. (12) and (13), Eq.(22) gets modified, in the extreme GR case, as

$$x \sim \alpha (z/2) \frac{m_p c^2}{3kT} \quad (32)$$

In all physically realistic cases of self-luminous objects, α is always finite. In the Newtonian case of $z \ll 1$, we found that, α increases rapidly with M and hence with z . Since increase of z implies stronger self-gravity, we may say that as if *stronger gravity churns out more radiation from self-luminous self-gravitating objects*. And as $z \rightarrow \infty$, the entire object becomes a ball of radiation/pure energy ($\rho_r/\rho_g \rightarrow \infty$). Note that this happens before the formation of any Event Horizon(EH) and which indicates that the EH is actually synonymous with the central singularity and the integration constant of the vacuum Schwarzschild solution has the unique value of zero (Mitra1 2005; Mitra2 2005). Actually, one can have continued gravitation collapse for arbitrary (small) M too provided ρ would be suitably high. In contrast to the Newtonian case, where a (relatively) higher z demands, higher M (Eq.[27]), in GR, the very fact that there could be continued gravitational collapse at any mass scale means that one can have high $z \gg 1$ for *arbitrary mass* and hence, one may have $\alpha \rightarrow 1$, at suitably high value of z , at arbitrary mass scale. For instance, for the Sun, $\alpha \approx 3 \times 10^{-5}$ and $z \approx 2 \times 10^{-6}$. But if we consider a collapsing hot proto-neutron star in its final stage when it is giving birth to a hot neutron star, $\alpha \approx 10^{-3}$ as $z \sim 10^{-1}$ (Mitra 2006). Note the rise in the value of α with

z even at a low mass scale of $M \sim 1M_\odot$ as we are about to enter the regime of Einstein gravity.

The gravitational mass energy of the star is defined as

$$Mc^2 = \int_0^R 4\pi r^2 \rho dr \quad (33)$$

The mean value of mass energy density is thus

$$\rho = \frac{3Mc^2}{4\pi R^3} \quad (34)$$

From Eq.(29), note that in the $z \gg 1$ range, the radius of the contracting body would be hovering around its instantaneous Schwarzschild radius, i.e., $R \approx R_s = 2GM/c^2$. Using this fact in the foregoing equation, we have

$$\rho = \frac{3c^8}{32\pi G^3 M^2} \quad (35)$$

Note that Eq.(31) implies that, for $z \gg 1$, $\rho_r \gg \rho_g$ so that total $\rho = \rho_r + \rho_g \approx \rho_r$. Further recalling that $\rho_r = aT^4$, from Eq.(35), we obtain

$$T = \left(\frac{3c^8}{32\pi a G^3 M^2} \right)^{1/4} \quad (36)$$

Numerically, one finds, that, for such a state, the mean temperature of the body in this phase is :

$$T \sim 600 \left(\frac{M}{M_\odot} \right)^{-1/2} \text{ MeV} \quad (37)$$

By substituting Eq.(37) in Eq.(32), we obtain

$$x \sim \alpha z \left(\frac{M}{15M_\odot} \right)^{1/2} \quad (38)$$

Note that, even in the extreme GR case, x increases with M , and, in particular the behaviour $x \propto M^{1/2}$ is just what we found for Newtonian RPSSs. But unlike the Newtonian case, in the GR case, one can have $z \gg 1$. Eq.(38) shows that, with $\alpha > 0$, and, $z \rightarrow \infty$, one would be able to satisfy the condition $x \gg 1$ at arbitrary mass scale for appropriate high value of $z \gg 1$. As mentioned earlier, occurrence of $x \gg 1$ means $\alpha = 1$ (rather than $\alpha \gg 1$, which would disrupt the star). For isolated bodies, radiation pressure and energy density are directly associated with outward radiation/heat flux. This outward radiation flow has a repulsive action on the plasma. As radiation pressure tends to grow unabated with unabated increase of z , repulsive effect on the plasma must be able to counterbalance the pull of gravity at some stage. And this stage corresponds to attainment of $L \approx L_{ed}$ or $\alpha \approx 1$. In fact, domination of radiation pressure is a much less demanding phenomenon than domination of radiation energy because recall that though the Newtonian supermassive stars have $p_r \gg p_g$, they still have $\rho_r \ll \rho_g$. On the other hand, since Eq.(31) demands $\rho_r \gg \rho_g$ at appropriately high z , such an occurrence actually automatically denotes domination of radiation pressure. Therefore, for $x \gg 1$, we may rewrite Eq.(38) as

$$x \approx z \left(\frac{M}{15M_\odot} \right)^{1/2} \approx 0.25 z \left(\frac{M}{M_\odot} \right)^{1/2} \quad z \gg 1 \quad (39)$$

The absence of z in Eq.(24) demands that one can have $x \gg 1$ only for very large values of M . On the other hand,

the presence of z in Eq.(39) shows that, in the extreme relativistic case, one can have RPSSs *for an arbitrary stellar mass*, high or low. Hence as one would proceed towards $z \rightarrow \infty$ during continued gravitational collapse, one must obtain radiation pressure supported configurations ($x \gg 1$) at arbitrary mass rather than finite mass BHs. Although we worked only in the regions of $z \ll 1$ (Eq.[24]) and $z \gg 1$ (Eq.[39]), the close similarity in the forms of Eqs.(24) and (39) strongly suggests that Eq.(39) may be valid for RPSSs in the entire relativistic range range of $z > 1$.

4 DISCUSSION

Newtonian stars are defined by $z \ll 1$ as well as $\rho_r \ll \rho_g$, i.e., $y \ll 1$. It is such self-imposed constraints which cause $x \ll 1$. However, even in the Newtonian regime, i.e., despite having $y \ll 1$ and $z \ll 1$, one can have RPSSs ($x \gg 1$) for masses above $7200M_\odot$. Hence we find that the non-occurrence of low mass RPSSs in the Newtonian regime is intricately linked with the occurrence of $z \ll 1$ and $y \ll 1$ in such cases. On the other hand, GR is unleashed in full glory during continued gravitational collapse when one can have $z \gg 1$ and $y \gg 1$ for an *arbitrary mass*, low or high. It naturally followed then that, in the extreme GR case, one can have a RPSS even at arbitrary low M . While occurrence of Newtonian supermassive stars may be only a theoretical possibility, Einstein RPSSs must be a reality because of the following simple reason:

As z tends to increase indefinitely during continued collapse, the strong gravity almost completely traps the collapse generated neutrinos and photons within the body of the star (Mitra and Glendenning 2006). The density of trapped radiation also increases because of stellar matter-radiation interaction, i.e., the diffusion of the internal radiation (Mitra 2006). As a result, the trapped radiation pressure and energy density increases at least as fast as p_r , $\rho_r \sim R_0^{-3}(1+z)^2$ (Mitra and Glendenning 2006). On the other hand, the locally defined Eddington luminosity grows as (Mitra 1998)

$$L_{ed} = \frac{4\pi GMc}{\kappa}(1+z) \quad (40)$$

where $\kappa \approx 0.4 \text{ cm}^2 \text{ g}^{-1}$ is the Thomson opacity. The radiation pressure associated with L_{ed} is

$$p_{ed} = \frac{1}{3} \frac{L_{ed}}{4\pi R^2 c} \propto R^{-2}(1+z) \quad (41)$$

Therefore, $p_r/p_{ed} \propto R^{-1}(1+z)$. Thus as R decreases and $1+z$ increases $p_r \rightarrow p_{ed}$ even though, initially, $p_r \ll p_{ed}$ and $L \ll L_{ed}$. It is at this stage that $L \rightarrow L_{ed}$ and $\alpha \rightarrow 1$. Simultaneously, one will have both $p_r \gg p_g$ and $\rho_r \gg \rho_g$ at this stage. Specific models of GR continued collapse which *do not* restrict ρ_r by any means *do clearly show that repulsive effects* of unabatedly rising of ρ_r and p_r may not only counterbalance the inward pull of gravity but even cause the fluid to bounce back (Herrera and Santos 2004; Herrera, Prisco & Barreto 2006). Such studies are fully consistent with the generic picture of formation quasistatic GR RPSSs at arbitrary mass scale discussed in this paper. The observed luminosity of such RPSSs will however be lower by a factor of $(1+z)^2$ than the local value because of joint effect of gravitational redshift and gravitational time dilation:

$$L_{ed}^\infty = \frac{L_{ed}}{(1+z)^2} = \frac{4\pi GMc}{\kappa(1+z)} \quad (42)$$

Consequently, even if the system would be assumed to be at a given fixed value of $z = z$, its observed duration as seen by a far away astronomer would be

$$t(z) = \frac{Mc^2}{L_{ed}^\infty} = \frac{kc}{4\pi G}(1+z) \quad (43)$$

Since in principle, during continued collapse, $z \rightarrow \infty$, clearly, the observed time scale for depletion of mass energy becomes infinite for arbitrary value of the opacity κ : $t = \infty$. Hence the RPSSs tend to collapse for infinite duration in order to attain the BH ($z = \infty$) state and, therefore, may be called as ‘‘Eternally Collapsing Objects’’ (ECOs) (Mitra 2000, 2002). It has been also shown that since the eventual BH mass would be zero, the comoving proper time for its formation would also be infinite (Mitra 2002). Since the observed BH Candidates must be formed in gravitational collapse and of finite age, they must be ECOs ($z \gg 1$) rather than true BHs ($z = \infty$). In retrospect, long back the RPSSs were suggested as the central engine of quasars (Hoyle and Fowler 1963; Fowler 1966). However this attempt failed because such RPSSs (i) were considered to be either Newtonian or Post Newtonian objects with low temperatures, (ii) The basic source of energy liberation was considered to be of nuclear origin. In contrast the relativistic RPSSs considered here are fed by energy release due to secular gravitational contraction and the source of energy is the entire mass energy ($E = Mc^2$). Even if they would momentarily be unstable, the contraction generated luminosity would ensure that they pass from one quasistatic state of $z = z_1 \gg 1$ to another with $z_2 > z_1$.

5 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks Stanley Robertson, Darryl Leiter, Norman Glendenning and P.S. Negi for various discussions. The author is also grateful to Felix Aharonian for persistent encouragement. The anonymous referee is also thanked for some constructive suggestions.

REFERENCES

- Chandrasekhar, S., 1967 *An Introduction to the Study of Stellar Structure* (Dover, New York, 1967)
- Fowler, W.A., 1966, *Astrophys. J.*, 144, 180
- Herrera, L. & Santos, N.O., 2004, *Phys. Rev. D* 70, 084004
- Herrera, L., Prisco, A.D., and Barreto, W., 2006, *Phys. Rev. D* 73, 024008 (gr-qc/0512032)
- Hoyle, F. & Fowler, W.A., 1963, 125, 169
- Mitra, A., 1998, preprint (astro-ph/9811402)
- Mitra, A., 2000, *Found. Phys. Lett.*, 13(6), 543, (astro-ph/9910408)
- Mitra, A., 2002, *Found. Phys. Lett.*, 15, 439, (astro-ph/0207056)
- Mitra, A., 2005a, preprint, (gr-qc/0512006)
- Mitra, A., 2005b, preprint, (physics/0504076)
- Mitra, A., 2006, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. Lett.*, 367, L66 (gr-qc/0601025)
- Mitra, A & Glendenning, N.K., 2006, Preprint

Vaidya, P.C., 1951, Proc. Ind. Acad. Sc., A33, 264

Weinberg, W., 1972, *Gravitation and Cosmology: Principles and Applications of General Theory of Relativity*, (John Wiley, New York, 1972)